

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/667,693	09/22/2000	James H. Johnson	032028-0311096	1007
909 PILLSBURY V	7590 08/21/2007 VINTHROP SHAW PIT	EXAMINER		
Eric S. Cherry - Docketing Supervisor			HELLNER, MARK	
	P.O. BOX 10500 MCLEAN, VA 22102		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3663	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/667,693	JOHNSON ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Mark Hellner	3663			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DON'S INC. OF A COMMENT OF THE MAILING DON'S INC. OF A COMMENT OF THE MAILING DON'S INC. OF A COMMENT OF THE MAILING	ATE OF THIS COMMUNION (a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u></u> .				
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)🖂	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
'=	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	1 1				
8)[_	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* ;	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not	received.			
Attachme	•		O			
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date			
3) 🔲 Info	rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of 6) Other:	Informal Patent Application			

Application/Control Number: 09/667,693

Art Unit: 3663

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 7, 9, 10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Elmer et al (4,247,768).

Elmer et al disclose a device for determining the velocity of vehicles traversing a roadway, the device comprising: a first radiation source (10 of station 1) producing a first beam and arranged at one side of the roadway; a first detector (11 of station 1) arranged at an opposite side of the roadway to receive the first beam from the first radiation source for producing an output signal indicating a presence or absence of the first beam; a second radiation source (10 of station 2) producing a second beam and arranged at one side of the roadway and spaced a predetermined distance (column 2, line 43) from the first radiation source; a second detector (11 of station 2) arranged at an opposite side of the roadway to receive the second beam form the second source for producing a signal indicating the presence or absence of the second beam; means (figure 4) indicating the interruptions of the first and second beams by the front and rear wheels of the vehicle; and analyzing means (figure 3) for calculating the speed and acceleration of the motor vehicle (speed is the scalar value of velocity and acceleration is the derivative of velocity).

Application/Control Number: 09/667,693

Art Unit: 3663

The structure recited above reads on claim 1.

Claims 7, 9, 10 and 18 read on the structure applied to claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 4-6, 9, 11, 13-17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elmer et al.

Claims 2, 9 and 11 recite components that would have been suggested by elements 12 and 13.

Seventy inches (claim 4) would have been an obvious dimensional variation suggested by the two feet disclosed.

Claims 5 and 14-16 recite notoriously well known properties of IR light sources.

Claim 6 recites notoriously well known detector structure.

The principle of operation of the device of Elmer et al apply to visible light (claim 13).

The road shape to which the device of Elmer et al would have been applied would have determined to position of the emitters and detectors with respect to the vehicle, thus rendering claim 17 obvious.

The subject matter of claims 19 and 20 would have been logically inferred from figure 4.

Claims 3, 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elmer et al in view of Bishop et al (5,210,702).

Bishop et al is cited to show that it was known at the time of the present application to use remote sensing to measure vehicle emissions. It would have been obvious for a state government to have combined the devices of Elmer et al and Bishop et al at one station in order to reduce cost.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The references cited show the level of skill in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark Hellner at telephone number 571 272 6981.

Mark Hellner

Primary Examiner

AU 3663